

fell to levels that could threaten the very survival of our Nation's independent family livestock producers. Farmers and ranchers have questioned whether a free and open market operates in the livestock and meat packing industry, and the issues of packer concentration and market access are at the core of their concerns.

This legislation will require the President to appoint a commission on concentration in the meat packing industry. The commission would be chaired by the Secretary of Agriculture and be comprised of cattle, hog, and lamb producers; experts in antitrust legislation; economists; corporate chief financial officers; and corporate procurement experts. The commission would be charged with achieving the following goals:

First, determine if the upcoming USDA study on concentration in the red meat packing industry represents current market conditions. Producers are concerned that the study is based on outdated information and does not cover critical aspects of the livestock industry. This study was mandated by Congress in the fiscal year 1992 Agricultural appropriations bill. Producers and consumers need to have confidence that the findings of this study will apply to current market conditions.

Second, review the adequacy of current antitrust laws with respect to the livestock industry. Four large packing companies control over 80 percent of the cattle slaughtered in this country. Fifteen years ago this level was only a third as much. Given this amount of market concentration, producers question whether current laws are adequate to ensure free, open, and competitive livestock markets.

Third, make recommendations regarding the adequacy of price discovery in the livestock industry. Producers question whether the regulations governing price discovery in the livestock industry ensure the operation of a free and open market.

Fourth, review the reasons for the large producer to retail price spread. Although producers have been receiving some of the lowest prices in recent history for their livestock, packers and retailers have been enjoying record profits. Both producers and consumers deserve to know the reasons behind this distressing price spread.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you and my colleagues to join me in examining the underlying reasons behind one of the most difficult periods for livestock producers in recent memory. This legislation can accomplish this.

#### A SALUTE TO THE WINNERS OF ILLINOIS PRESS ASSOCIATION AWARDS

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a number of news publications in my district whose efforts to uphold the highest principles of journalism were recently recognized by the Illinois Press Association at its annual awards ceremony.

First place winners in both large and small weekly newspaper divisions cover portions of my district. The Southtown Economist of Chicago was named best large daily newspaper

in the State. Press Publications of Elmhurst, IL took first place in the large weekly category and The Regional News of Palos Heights, IL was the winner in the small weekly category. These newspapers also won other numerous awards.

Other first place winners from my district included the Star newspaper of Chicago Heights, IL, which was honored for newspaper design and spot news photography, and The Doings of Hinsdale, IL which was recognized for an in-depth report on the teardown of homes in its community.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate these newspapers and their hard-working journalists on earning these prestigious honors.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1995

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for Rollcall No. 717, the Farr fish habitat amendment. At the time of the vote, I was meeting with Gen. Ronald Fogelman, Chief of Staff for the U.S. Air Force, at the Pentagon regarding the Minot Air Force Base. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1976, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1995

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report for H.R. 1976, the Agriculture Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

H.R. 1976 is not a perfect bill. Next year's bill continues an alarming trend in cutting important programs for agriculture research, animal and plant inspection, food safety and inspection, conservation programs, and rural housing and development.

Certainly some savings have accrued from the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture and closing of numerous field offices nationwide.

But we must guard against debilitating cuts that prevent these agencies from fulfilling their important missions.

Cuts to research, cuts to inspection, cuts to food safety, cuts to conservation programs—we are short-sighted in cutting back on these investments in this, the most productive sector of our economy.

But, despite my reservations about these cuts, we must judge the conference product against the House version of this bill, and we must judge it against what is possible this year and in this political climate—and based on these comparisons, the conference report is an improved product.

The conference report improves upon the House funding level for research and extension.

It improves upon the House funding level for food safety and inspection. It improves upon the House funding level for rural housing and economic development.

I have particular praise for three items of importance to California agriculture and to my district.

First, funds have been included for buildings and facilities construction within the Cooperative State Research Service, including funds for an important integrated pest management research facility at the University of California at Davis and at Riverside.

Although some Members disagree with funding for these facilities, and the House bill contained no funds for this construction program, the conference agreement is the right decision.

It makes sure that our important agriculture research institutions who have worked in good faith over the years are not left high and dry. But it also directs the institutions to provide a specific and verifiable cost-share, and it tells them this is not an unlimited source of funds—it brings fair closure to this account over the next 2 years.

Second, the conferees fought successfully and in defense of the House position for the Market Promotion Program.

There is probably no more important tool for export promotion than MPP.

Agriculture exports, projected to exceed \$50 billion this year—up from \$43.5 billion for fiscal year 1994—are vital to the United States.

Agriculture exports strengthen farm income. Agriculture exports provide jobs for nearly a million Americans.

Agriculture exports generate nearly \$100 billion in related economic activity.

Agriculture exports produce a positive trade balance of nearly \$20 billion.

If U.S. agriculture is to remain competitive under GATT, we must have policies and programs that remain competitive with those of our competitors abroad.

GATT did not eliminate export subsidies, it only reduced them.

The European Union spent, over the last 5 years, an average of \$10.6 billion in annual export subsidies—the United States spent less than \$2 billion.

The E.U. spends more on wine exports—\$89 million—than the United States currently spends for all commodities under the market promotion program.

MPP is critical to U.S. agriculture's ability to develop, maintain and expand export markets in the new post-GATT environment, and MPP is a proven success.

In California, MPP has been tremendously successful in helping promote exports of California citrus, raisins, walnuts, almonds, peaches and other specialty crops.

We have to remember that an increase in agriculture exports means jobs: a 10 percent increase in agricultural exports creates over 13,000 new jobs in agriculture and related industries like manufacturing, processing, marketing and distribution.

For every \$1 we invest in MPP, we reap a \$16 return in additional agriculture exports. In short, the Market Promotion Program is a program that performs for American taxpayers.

The conferees have wisely held on to this important program in the face of ill-informed and short-sighted action by the Senate.

Third, the conference committee has continued to provide important funding for special

research grants in the Cooperative State Research Service while continuing a significant commitment to competitive grants.

The committee, sometimes in the face of significant opposition, has always believed there is a place for both competitive grants and special grants.

Special grants ensure that particular attention is paid to regional needs, temporary needs, and agricultural research where a special project is required. The grants are fully cost-shared and generally leverage efforts that are already underway in many of our land-grant universities and other research institutions. The research projects are of limited duration.

The conference committee has decided correctly to fund special research grants. The Russian wheat aphid and the viticulture consortium are not burning issues for most Americans. But in California, these represent important research efforts for agricultural commodities that are making significant contributions to our economy.

I know the other special grants enumerated by the conference report are of equal value to other States and regions in addressing special problems, and I commend the conference committee for their support of these initiatives.

In summary, this is not a perfect bill, but the conference report is a fair balancing of the many needs and many issues within the committee's jurisdiction. I commend Chairman JOE SKEEN and Ranking Member DICK DURBIN for their efforts in support of American agriculture during the conference committee deliberations, and I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

#### IN HONOR OF HUGO PRINCZ

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 18, 1995*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a special man who lives in my district in Highland Park, New Jersey: Mr. Hugo Princz.

Hugo is one of a few American survivors of the Holocaust in Nazi Germany. His family was American, living in Slovakia in 1942 when all were arrested by the Nazis. The SS refused to release the Princz family, which should have been done as part of the Red Cross civilian prisoner exchange, instead the family was interned because it was Jewish.

Hugo's mother, father, and sister were sent to Treblinka death camp and gassed on arrival. He and his brothers were sent to Auschwitz, and worked as slave laborers. Mr. Princz's job was to stack dead bodies for incineration. While in Auschwitz, Hugo's two brothers were killed. By the war's end, Hugo was in Dachau and selected for extermination. He was fortunately saved by the U.S. Army when our soldiers boarded a train carrying Hugo and other prisoners and saw U.S.A. embroiled on his jersey.

After the war, Mr. Princz began what would turn out to be a 50-year struggle with the German Government for reparations—a fight in honor of his family and all of the people who were tortured by the Nazis. In 1955, Germany rejected Mr. Princz's application for its reparations program because his U.S. citizenship made him ineligible under German law.

Hugo's struggle continued without success for decades. German legislators refused to accept responsibility for the actions of the Nazis and recognize Mr. Princz and his struggle for survival.

Hugo looked to Congress to assist him in his struggle. What he brought to me and the many Members of Congress who supported him was a just and righteous cause. Hugo's lawyers, William Marks from the firm of Powell, Goldstein, Frazer & Murphy, and Steven Perles should be commended for their work on Hugo's behalf. They worked feverishly with Members of Congress, for little reward, to assist Hugo in his efforts. Finally, on September 19, 1995, the roller coaster ride of Hugo's struggle came to a successful conclusion. The German Government recognized his struggle and provided him with the reparations he was owed.

Mr. Speaker, Hugo Princz is an inspiration to everyone who knows him or has heard him tell his story. He managed to overcome the worst nightmare humanity has ever created. Yet his strength and determination in the face of such strong adversity will remain in the hearts and minds of all who know him, and that will be his legacy.

HAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY ALF THOMPSON

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 18, 1995*

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish Mr. Alf Thompson a happy 100th birthday. Alf was born on November 11, 1895, and has lived a truly memorable life.

As a young man, Alf enlisted in the Army, and in 1917 he was sent to the Philippines where he joined the Machinegun Company of the 31st Infantry Regiment in Manila. While in the Philippines Alf became the company clerk, and began to consider applying for an officer's commission.

In 1919 Alf was reassigned to Vladivostok, Siberia. Here he attended the American Expeditionary Force's Officer Candidate School, and upon graduation was selected to lead the 31st Infantry Regiment's Signal Platoon. He was charged with the responsibility of keeping Siberia's only source of coal safe as it was transported on the Trans-Siberian Railroad.

When World War I ended Alf left the Army and began a successful career in private business. When World War II erupted Alf once again when to work for his Nation. He left the private sector and joined the American Red Cross. He went to the Mediterranean to help the soldiers, sailors, and airmen stationed in North Africa, Sicily, and Italy. Years later, when soldiers returned to Illinois from Vietnam, Alf helped organize the State's welcome home program, and when the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial in Washington, DC needed additional monetary support, Alf helped raise the necessary funds.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent this exceptional man in Congress. I am proud to join with Alf's friends and family to celebrate his 100th birthday, and I wish him many more happy years.

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. RUTH WU

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 18, 1995*

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention the retirement of Dr. Ruth Wu as the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services at California State University, Los Angeles. Dr. Wu has dedicated her whole career to the education of young people in health careers, particularly nursing. She is a person of great vision and was able to put in place changes in curriculum and program which allowed students to be prepared to meet the needs of a changing society.

An example of her foresight is her dedication and commitment to the establishment of the Edward R. Roybal Institute for Applied Gerontology on the campus of Cal State L.A. Her hard work and perseverance in promoting the Gerontology Institute among the university faculty and administrators resulted in the development of a gerontology program which is multidisciplinary in scope and community based in practice.

Dr. Wu has distinguished herself first in the clinical role as a public health nurse in California, New York, and Michigan (1946–57); then in the faculty role as a pediatric specialist at Henry Ford Community College, Michigan (1958–60), U.C.L.A. (1962–68) and Cal State L.A. (1971–95). Dr. Wu was initially appointed as a visiting associate professor to the Department of Nursing in 1971.

Dr. Wu's expertise in curriculum development and her leadership skills were quickly recognized and she was appointed interim Department Chair 1992–93, and her permanent Department Chair and professor in 1993–94. Her contributions from that point on are primarily in her third area of distinguished service, that of administration. From 1972 to 1982, Dr. Wu served as the Department Chair of Nursing. During those years she offered outstanding leadership in curriculum development, developing at that time one of the most forward thinking nursing curriculums in the country. Her education partnerships with the establishment of the on-site R.N. transfer baccalaureate program offered at LAC-USC Medical Center.

Dr. Wu's contributions to nursing have been recognized both nationally and statewide. In 1981, she became a fellow in the American Academy of Nursing, a very prestigious position. In 1987, she was awarded the Lulu Hassenplug outstanding nurse educator award by the California Nurses Association.

Dr. Wu moved to the school offices in 1982–83, first as the acting Associate Dean of the School of Fine and Applied Arts. In 1983–84, she served as acting Dean of that school. In 1984–85, Dr. Wu became the founding dean of the new school of health and human services, and continued in that role until her retirement in 1995.

The California State University, Los Angeles and its students are losing a great educator.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Ruth Wu for a most distinguished and memorable career.

An example of her foresight is her dedication and commitment to the establishment of the Edward R. Roybal Institute for Applied Gerontology on the campus of Cal State L.A. Her hard work and perseverance.